arXiv:1703.08948v1 [math.CV] 27 Mar 2017

Complex curves in pseudoconvex Runge domains containing discrete subsets

Antonio Alarcón

Abstract Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be a connected pseudoconvex Runge domain, M be an open Riemann surface, and $E \subset M$ be a discrete subset. We prove that for any proper injective map $f\colon E \to \Omega$ there is a Runge domain $D \subset M$ such that $E \subset D$, D is a deformation retract of M, and f extends to a proper holomorphic embedding $D \hookrightarrow \Omega$. In particular, every discrete subset $\Lambda \subset \Omega$ is contained in a properly embedded complex curve in Ω with any prescribed topology (possibly infinite).

Keywords complex curve, holomorphic embedding, peudoconvex domain, Runge domain.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) 32H02, 32E30, 32T05.

1. Introduction

A problem that has been the focus of interest is to determine whether a connected domain Ω in a complex Euclidean space $\mathbb{C}^N$ ($N \geq 2$) admits closed complex curves containing a given discrete subset of Ω (see, among others, [16, 17, 11, 25, 12]). In this paper we are interested in the particular case of embedded complex curves in domains of $\mathbb{C}^2$. To the best of the author's knowledge, the most general result so far in this direction dates back to 1996 and says that for any *pseudoconvex Runge domain* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ and any discrete subset $\Lambda \subset \Omega$ there is a proper holomorphic embedding $\mathbb{D} \hookrightarrow \Omega$, of the open unit disc $\mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{C}$, whose image contains Λ (see Forstnerič, Globevnik, and Stensønes [13]). Such disc was found as a leaf in a holomorphic foliation of Ω by holomorphic discs. It is moreover very likely that a slight refinement of the construction in [13] provides, for any such Ω and Λ, properly embedded complex curves in Ω, containing Λ, with any *finite* topology; a trickier question is whether there exist such curves with arbitrary (possibly infinite) topology. The present paper gives an affirmative answer.

The following is a simplified version of our main result (see Theorem 3.1 for a more precise statement including Runge approximation).

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be a connected pseudoconvex Runge domain, M be an open Riemann surface, and $E \subset M$ be a discrete subset. Given a proper injective map $f\colon E \to \Omega$ there is a Runge domain $D \subset M$ such that $E \subset D$, D is a deformation retract of M, and the map f extends to D as a proper holomorphic embedding $D \hookrightarrow \Omega$.*

Note that the subset $f(E) \subset \Omega$ in the above theorem is discrete; reciprocally, every discrete subset $\Lambda \subset \Omega$ is of the form $\Lambda = f(E)$ for suitable data E and f as in

the theorem. Moreover, the domain D is homeomorphic, hence also diffeomorphic, to the arbitrarily given open Riemann surface M. We therefore obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 1.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be a connected pseudoconvex Runge domain and $\Lambda \subset \Omega$ be a discrete subset. On each open connected orientable smooth surface M there is a complex structure J such that the open Riemann surface $R = (M, J)$ admits a proper holomorphic embedding $R \hookrightarrow \Omega$ whose image contains Λ.*

If we choose $M = \mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{C}$ then the domain D furnished by Theorem 1.1 is Runge in $\mathbb{C}$ and relatively compact, hence biholomorphic to the unit disc $\mathbb{D}$; we thereby recover the above mentioned result from [13]. However, in general, one cannot choose D to be biholomorphic to M in the theorem; for instance, whenever that Ω is bounded and M is *Liouville* (also called *parabolic*, i.e., carrying no negative non-constant subharmonic functions). On the other hand, the domain $D \subset M$ can always be chosen of *hyperbolic* type (i.e., carrying negative non-constant subharmonic functions); the same happens to the complex structure J in Corollary 1.2.

Theorem 1.1 is already known in the particular case $\Omega = \mathbb{C}^2$ (see Ritter [24]). It also has been proved recently that the unit ball $\mathbb{B} \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ carries *complete* properly embedded complex curves, with arbitrary topology, containing any given discrete subset of $\mathbb{B}$ (see Globevnik and the author [1]; see also [2, 18] and references therein for previous results in this direction). We emphasize that the assumptions on the connected domain Ω (i.e., pseudoconvexity and having the Runge property) cannot be entirely removed from the statement of Theorem 1.1; indeed, there are smoothly bounded relatively compact domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ and points $z \in \Omega$ for which there is no proper holomorphic map $\mathbb{D} \to \Omega$ passing through z (see Forstnerič and Globevnik [11]). It is an open question whether Theorem 1.1 remains valid when Ω is an arbitrary (non-Runge) pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$, even in case $M = \mathbb{D}$ (cf. [13, p. 559]). To this respect, it is known that the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 holds for the pseudoconvex domains $\Omega = \mathbb{C} \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$ and $\Omega = (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})^2$ (see Ritter [24] and also Lárusson and Ritter [20]), which are not Runge in $\mathbb{C}^2$.

The strong point of Theorem 1.1 is of course the embeddedness of the examples. Recall that self-intersections of complex curves in $\mathbb{C}^2$ are stable under small deformations; this is why, in general, constructing embedded complex curves in $\mathbb{C}^2$ is a much more demanding task that in $\mathbb{C}^N$ for $N \geq 3$. Regarding this, we point out that the main result in [13], which we recalled at the beginning of this introduction, is actually established for pseudoconvex Runge domains in $\mathbb{C}^N$ for arbitrary dimension $N \geq 2$. Furthermore, the analogues of Theorem 1.1 for arbitrary (possibly non-Runge) pseudoconvex domains in $\mathbb{C}^N$ for $N \geq 3$ easily follows from the results by Forstnerič and Slapar in [14] (see also [10, §9.10]) and by Drinovec Drnovšek and Forstnerič in [7, 8], even choosing the domain D to agree with M provided that M is a bordered Riemann surface; the same is true for pseudoconvex domains in $\mathbb{C}^2$ if we allow the holomorphic curves to have self-intersections. Previous partial results in this direction can be found in Globevnik [16, 17] and Forstnerič and Globevnik [11]. In what concerns targets more general than pseudoconvex domains in $\mathbb{C}^N$, the analogues of Theorem 1.1 holds for holomorphic embeddings into any Stein manifold, of dimension at least three, having the density property; in fact, in this framework there is no need to shrink the initial open Riemann surface and one

may choose $D = M$ (see Andrist and Wold [5] and Andrist, Forstnerič, Ritter, and Wold [4]). The same holds for holomorphic *immersions* into any Stein surface with the density property (see [5, 4]). Even more generally, in light of the results in [7] one is led to expect that the analogues of Theorem 1.1 should also hold for holomorphic immersions into an arbitrary Stein surface and for holomorphic embeddings into an arbitrary Stein manifold of dimension greater than two (without asking them to enjoy the density property).

Concerning our method of proof, besides some of the nice properties of pseudoconvex Runge domains (see Section 2), it exploits the classical Mergelyan approximation theorem for holomorphic functions and the theory of holomorphic automorphisms of complex Euclidean spaces. The latter has already shown to be a powerful tool for constructing embedded complex submanifolds in $\mathbb{C}^N$ for $N \geq 2$, in particular, holomorphic curves in $\mathbb{C}^2$ (we refer to [10, Chapter 4] for a survey of results in the subject). In particular, the use of holomorphic automorphisms of the space is crucial in the construction method, different from ours, developed by Forstnerič, Globevnik, and Stensønes in [13].

Outline of the paper. Section 2 is devoted to introduce some notation and recall the basic concepts, definitions, and results that will be needed throughout this paper. In Section 3 we state the main result of the paper (Theorem 3.1) and show how it implies Theorem 1.1. Finally, we prove Theorem 3.1 in Section 4.

2. Preliminaries

Given subsets A and B of a topological space X we shall use the notation $A \Subset B$ to mean that the closure $\overline{A}$ of A is a subset of the interior $\mathring{B}$ of B. A subset $E \subset X$ is said to be *discrete* if it is closed and every point in E is isolated; equivalently, if no point of X is a limit point of E. By a *domain* in X we just mean an open subset, and by a *compact domain* the closure of a domain.

We denote $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. For any integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $|\cdot|$ and $\mathrm{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$ the Euclidean norm and distance in the complex Euclidean space $\mathbb{C}^N$, respectively.

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$. A domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ is said to be *pseudoconvex* if it carries a strictly plurisubharmonic exhaustion function $\Omega \to \mathbb{R}$; this happens if and only if Ω is holomorphically convex, if and only if Ω is a domain of holomorphy, and if and only if Ω is Stein. Every domain in $\mathbb{C}$ is pseudoconvex; this is why pseudoconvexity is usually defined only for domains in higher dimensions. Every convex domain in $\mathbb{C}^N$ is pseudoconvex but the converse is not true. See Range [23] for a brief introduction to pseudoconvexity, and e. g. Hörmander [19] or Range [22] for further developments.

A domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ is said to be *Runge* if every holomorphic function $\Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ may be approximated, uniformly on compact subsets in Ω, by holomorphic polynomials $\mathbb{C}^N \to \mathbb{C}$. Likewise, a compact subset $L \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ is said to be *polynomially convex* if for each point $z \in \mathbb{C}^N \setminus L$ there is a (holomorphic) polynomial P such that $|P(z)| > \sup\{|P(w)| \colon w \in L\}$; this is equivalent to that every holomorphic function on a neighborhood of L may be approximated, uniformly on L, by polynomials $\mathbb{C}^N \to \mathbb{C}$. We refer to Stout [27] for a monograph on polynomial convexity.

Given a pseudoconvex Runge domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^N$, a smooth plurisubharmonic exhaustion function ϱ for Ω, and a number $c \in \mathbb{R}$, the set

$$\Omega_c = \{z \in \Omega \colon \varrho(z) < c\}$$

is relatively compact in Ω and a Runge domain in Ω (the latter meaning that every holomorphic function $\Omega_c \to \mathbb{C}$ may be approximated, uniformly on compact subsets in Ω_c, by holomorphic functions $\Omega \to \mathbb{C}$; see [27, Theorem 1.3.7]). Moreover, the set

$$\{z \in \Omega \colon \varrho(z) \leq c\}$$

is a polynomially convex compact set in $\mathbb{C}^N$ (see [27, p. 25-26]).

A compact set K in an open Riemann surface M is said *$\mathscr{O}(M)$-convex* (also called *holomorphically convex* or *Runge* in M) if every continuous function $K \to \mathbb{C}$ being holomorphic on $\mathring{K}$ may be approximated, uniformly on K, by holomorphic functions $M \to \mathbb{C}$. By the classical Runge-Mergelyan theorem (see [26, 21, 6]), this happens if and only if $M \setminus K$ has no relatively compact connected components in M.

A connected complex manifold is said to be *Liouville* if it does not carry non-constant negative plurisubharmonic functions; open Riemann surfaces which are not Liouville (i.e., carrying negative non-constant subharmonic functions) are called *hyperbolic* (see Farkas and Kra [9, p. 179]). If a connected open Riemann surface is hyperbolic then so is every connected domain on it (viewed as an open Riemann surface). Throughout the paper, we shall always assume that Riemann surfaces are connected unless the contrary is stated.

A *compact bordered Riemann surface* is a compact Riemann surface R with nonempty boundary $bR \subset R$ consisting of finitely many pairwise disjoint smooth Jordan curves; the interior $\mathring{R} = R \setminus bR$ of R is said to be a *bordered Riemann surface*. Every bordered Riemann surface is hyperbolic. It is classical that every compact bordered Riemann surface is diffeomorphic to a smoothly bounded compact domain in an open Riemann surface. We shall denote by $\mathscr{A}^1(R)$ the space of functions $R \to \mathbb{C}$ of class $\mathscr{C}^1$ which are holomorphic on $\mathring{R}$.

3. Statement of the main result and proof of Theorem 1.1

The main result of the present paper may be stated as follows.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be a connected pseudoconvex Runge domain, M be an open Riemann surface, $K \subset M$ be a connected, smoothly bounded, $\mathscr{O}(M)$-convex compact domain, $E \subset M$ be a discrete subset, and $f \colon K \cup E \to \Omega$ be a proper injective map such that $f|_K$ is a holomorphic embedding. Then, given a number $\epsilon > 0$ and a connected polynomially convex compact set $L \subset \Omega$ satisfying*

$$L \cap f(bK) = \varnothing \quad \text{and} \quad L \cap f(E \setminus K) = \varnothing, \tag{3.1}$$

there are a Runge domain $D \subset M$ and a proper holomorphic embedding $\widetilde{f} \colon D \hookrightarrow \Omega$ enjoying the following conditions:

(a) *$K \cup E \subset D$ and the domain D is a deformation retract of (and hence homeomorphic to) M.*

(b) *$|\widetilde{f}(p) - f(p)| < \epsilon$ for all $p \in K$.*

(c) $\widetilde{f}|_E = f|_E$.
(d) $\widetilde{f}(D \setminus \mathring{K}) \cap L = \varnothing$.

Furthermore, the domain D may be chosen of hyperbolic type.

Note that, since K is compact, the assumption that the map $f\colon K \cup E \to \Omega$ is proper is equivalent to that $f|_E\colon E \to \Omega$ is a proper map. We defer the proof of Theorem 3.1 to Section 4.

We claim that Theorem 1.1 in the introduction follows from the above theorem. Indeed, assume for a moment that Theorem 3.1 holds. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be a connected pseudoconvex Runge domain, M be an open Riemann surface, $E \subset M$ be a discrete subset, and $f\colon E \to \Omega$ be a proper injective map. Choose a simply-connected, smoothly bounded, connected compact domain K in M with $K \cap E = \varnothing$, and extend f to $K \cup E$ as an injective map that is a holomorphic embedding on K. Also choose a connected polynomially convex compact set $L \subset \Omega \setminus f(K \cup E)$. Theorem 3.1 applied to these data and any number $\epsilon > 0$ furnishes a Runge domain $D \subset M$ and a proper holomorphic embedding $\widetilde{f}\colon D \hookrightarrow \Omega$ such that D contains E, D is a deformation retract of M, and $\widetilde{f}(p) = f(p)$ for all points $p \in E$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1 under the assumption that Theorem 3.1 holds.

Since the domain $D \subset M$ in Theorem 3.1 may be chosen of hyperbolic type, the above argument shows that the same is true (as we claimed in the introduction) for the domain D in Theorem 1.1.

We finish this section with the following corollary of Theorem 3.1, which is a more precise version of Corollary 1.2 in the introduction.

Corollary 3.2. *Let Ω, M, K, E, and f be as in Theorem 3.1 and denote by J_0 the complex structure operator on M. Then there exists a complex structure J on M such that $J = J_0$ on a connected neighborhood of $K \cup E$ and there is a map $\widetilde{f}\colon M \to \Omega$ that is a proper holomorphic embedding with respect to J, approximates f uniformly on K, and $\widetilde{f}|_E = f$. Furthermore, the complex structure J may be chosen to be hyperbolic.*

Proof. Let $D \subset M$ and $\widetilde{f}\colon D \hookrightarrow \Omega$ be the domain and the holomorphic embedding provided by Theorem 3.1 applied to the given data. The complex structure J on M which makes it biholomorphic to D and the map $\widetilde{f}\colon D = (M, J) \to \Omega$ clearly satisfy the conclusion of the corollary. □

4. Proof of Theorem 3.1

Let Ω, M, K, E, f, and L be as in the statement of Theorem 3.1.

First of all assume for a moment that Theorem 3.1 holds except for the final assertion and let us explain why the Runge domain $D \subset M$ provided by the theorem can always be chosen of hyperbolic type. Indeed, it suffices to choose a Runge domain $M' \subset M$ of hyperbolic type such that $K \cup E \subset M$ and M' is a deformation retract of M, and apply the first part of Theorem 3.1 to the same data but replacing the given open Riemann surface M by M'. The domain $D \subset M' \subset M$ and the map $\widetilde{f}\colon D \to \Omega$

which we obtain in this way satisfy the first part of Theorem 3.1 with respect to the open Riemann surface M'. Since M' is of hyperbolic type and a deformation retract of M, we infer that D is also of hyperbolic type and, by condition (a), a deformation retract of M. Moreover, since M' is a Runge domain in M and D is a Runge domain in M', D is also a Runge domain in M. Thus, the hyperbolic-type domain D and the map $\widetilde{f}$ satisfy the conclusion of the theorem with respect to the open Riemann surface M as well.

This shows that it suffices to prove Theorem 3.1 without taking care of the conformal type of the domain D which we obtain. We now proceed with that.

4.1. Outline of the proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$.

Set $L_0 := L$ and choose an increasing sequence of connected polynomially convex compact domains

$$L_1 \Subset L_2 \Subset \cdots \Subset \bigcup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} L_j = \Omega \tag{4.1}$$

in $\mathbb{C}^2$ such that $L_0 \subset \mathring{L}_1$ and

$$f(E) \cap bL_j = \varnothing \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.2}$$

To construct such we argue as follows. Take a smooth plurisubharmonic exhaustion function $\varrho\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ (recall that Ω is pseudoconvex) and a sequence of real numbers $c_1 < c_2 < \cdots$ such that $\lim_{j\to\infty} c_j = +\infty$ and each c_j is a regular value of ϱ that satisfies $f(E) \cap \{z \in \Omega\colon \varrho(z) = c_j\} = \varnothing$ (recall that $f(E) \subset \Omega$ is discrete). Choose c_1 large enough so that $L_0 \subset \{z \in \Omega\colon \varrho(z) < c_1\}$. Thus, it suffices to define L_j as the connected component of $\{z \in \Omega\colon \varrho(z) \le c_j\}$ containing L_0, $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Set

$$\Lambda_j := f(E) \cap L_j = f(E) \cap \mathring{L}_j \subset \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad E_j := f^{-1}(\Lambda_j) \subset M, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.3}$$

(See (4.2).) Thus, (4.1) ensures that $\Lambda_j \subset \Lambda_{j+1}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$E_1 \subset E_2 \subset \cdots \subset \bigcup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} E_j = E. \tag{4.4}$$

Set $E_0 := E \cap K$ and $\Lambda_0 := f(E_0)$ and assume without loss of generality that L_1 is chosen large enough so that $f(K) \subset \mathring{L}_1$; it follows that $\Lambda_0 \subset \Lambda_1$ and $E_0 \subset E_1$. It is clear that if $E_j \neq \varnothing$ for a given $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ then E_j is finite and $f|_{E_j}\colon E_j \to \Lambda_j$ is a bijection; recall that $E \subset M$ is discrete and $f|_E\colon E \to \Omega$ is a proper map.

In the open Riemann surface M we choose an increasing sequence of connected, smoothly bounded, $\mathscr{O}(M)$-convex compact domains

$$K_0 := K \Subset K_1 \Subset K_2 \Subset \cdots \Subset \bigcup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} K_j = M \tag{4.5}$$

such that

$$\text{the Euler characteristic } \chi(K_j \setminus \mathring{K}_{j-1}) \in \{-1, 0\} \text{ for all } j \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.6}$$

Such can be constructed by standard topological arguments; we refer for instance to [3, Lemma 4.2] for a detailed proof. Set $M_0 := K_0$ and $f_0 := f|_{M_0}\colon M_0 \to \Omega$ and fix a number $0 < \epsilon_0 < \epsilon/2$.

To prove the theorem we shall inductively construct

(A) an increasing sequence of connected, smoothly bounded, $\mathscr{O}(M)$-convex compact domains $M_1 \Subset M_2 \Subset \cdots$ with $M_0 \subset \mathring{M}_1$,
(B) a sequence of holomorphic embeddings $f_j \colon M_j \to \Omega$ $(j \in \mathbb{N})$, and
(C) a decreasing sequence of numbers $\epsilon_j > 0$ $(j \in \mathbb{N})$,

such that the following conditions are satisfied for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$:

(1_j) M_j is *homeomorphically isotopic* to K_j, meaning that
$$(\imath_{M_j})_*(H_1(M_j;\mathbb{Z})) = (\imath_{K_j})_*(H_1(K_j;\mathbb{Z})) \subset H_1(M;\mathbb{Z})$$
where $(\imath_{M_j})_* \colon H_1(M_j;\mathbb{Z}) \to H_1(M;\mathbb{Z})$ and $(\imath_{K_j})_* \colon H_1(K_j;\mathbb{Z}) \to H_1(M;\mathbb{Z})$ are the homomorphisms between the first homology groups with integer coefficients induced by the inclusion maps $\imath_{M_j} \colon M_j \to M$ and $\imath_{K_j} \colon K_j \to M$, respectively. (Notice that $(\imath_{M_j})_*$ and $(\imath_{K_j})_*$ are injective homomorphisms since M_j and K_j are $\mathscr{O}(M)$-convex.)
(2_j) $M_j \cap E = E_j$.
(3_j) $|f_j(p) - f_{j-1}(p)| < \epsilon_{j-1}$ for all $p \in M_{j-1}$.
(4_j) $f_j(p) = f(p)$ for all $p \in E_j$.
(5_j) $f_j(M_j) \cap f(E \setminus E_j) = \varnothing$.
(6_j) $f_j(M_j) \subset \mathring{L}_{j+1}$.
(7_j) $f_j(bM_j) \cap L_j = \varnothing$.
(8_j) $f_j(M_i \setminus \mathring{M}_{i-1}) \cap L_{i-1} = \varnothing$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, j$.
(9_j) $0 < \epsilon_j < \epsilon_{j-1}/2$.
(10_j) If $g \colon M \to \mathbb{C}^2$ is a holomorphic map such that $|g(p) - f_j(p)| < 2\epsilon_j$ for all $p \in M_j$, then $g|_{M_{j-1}} \colon M_{j-1} \to \mathbb{C}^2$ is an embedding which assumes values in Ω and satisfies $g(M_i \setminus \mathring{M}_{i-1}) \cap L_{i-1} = \varnothing$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, j-1$.

Condition (1_j) is equivalent to that there is a compact domain $K'_j \subset M$ such that both M_j and K_j are strong deformation retracts of K'_j.

Assume for a moment that such sequences are already constructed. Set
$$D := \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} M_j \subset M.$$
Properties (4.5), (A), (1_j), and (2_j) guarantee that D is a Runge domain in M and satisfies condition (a); recall that $K = K_0 = M_0$. On the other hand, by properties (3_j) and (9_j) there is a limit holomorphic map
$$\widetilde{f} := \lim_{j \to \infty} f_j \colon D \to \mathbb{C}^2$$
such that
$$|\widetilde{f}(p) - f_j(p)| < 2\epsilon_j < \epsilon \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$
Thus, taking into account properties (4.1), (4.4), (4_j), and (10_j), $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we infer that $\widetilde{f}$ is proper holomorphic embedding $D \hookrightarrow \Omega$ and meets conditions (b), (c), and (d); recall that $L_0 = L$. To summarize, the domain D and the embedding $\widetilde{f}$ satisfy the conclusion of the theorem.

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1 under the assumption that the sequences stated in (A), (B), and (C) above exist. Let us now prove their existence.

4.2. The induction. To complete the proof of Theorem 3.1 it remains to show the induction. Recall that the basis is given by the already fixed M_0, f_0, and ϵ_0; notice that, taking into account (3.1) and that $f(K \cup E) \subset \Omega$, these data enjoy conditions (1_0), (2_0), (4_0), (5_0), and (7_0), while the other ones are vacuous for $j = 0$.

For the inductive step assume that for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we already have sets M_i, maps f_i, and numbers ϵ_i satisfying the above properties for $i = 0, \ldots, j-1$, and let us provide M_j, f_j, and ϵ_j. We distinguish cases depending on the Euler characteristic of $K_j \setminus \mathring{K}_{j-1}$, which, by (4.6), is either -1 or 0.

Case 1: Assume that the Euler characteristic $\chi(K_j \setminus \mathring{K}_{j-1}) = -1$. In this case $K_j \setminus \mathring{K}_{j-1}$ is composed of finitely many compact annuli and exactly one *pair of pants*, i.e., a compact domain in M which is homeomorphic to a topological sphere from which three open topological discs have been removed. Thus, taking into account (1_{j-1}), there is a smooth Jordan arc $\gamma \subset M \setminus (E \cup \mathring{M}_{j-1})$, with the two endpoints in bM_{j-1} and being otherwise disjoint from M_{j-1}, such that $M_{j-1} \cup \gamma$ is $\mathscr{O}(M)$-convex and the image of the injective group homomorphism $(\imath_{M_{j-1}\cup\gamma})_* \colon H_1(M_{j-1} \cup \gamma; \mathbb{Z}) \to H_1(M; \mathbb{Z})$ equals $(\imath_{K_j})_*(H_1(K_j; \mathbb{Z}))$; here $\imath_{M_{j-1}\cup\gamma} \colon M_{j-1} \cup \gamma \to M$ denotes the inclusion map. By properties (6_{j-1}) and (7_{j-1}) we may extend f_{j-1}, with the same name, to a smooth embedding $f_{j-1} \colon M_{j-1} \cup \gamma \to \mathbb{C}^2$ such that

$$f_{j-1}(\gamma) \subset \mathring{L}_j \setminus (L_{j-1} \cup f(E)). \tag{4.7}$$

Thus, if we are given a number $\epsilon' > 0$, by Mergelyan's theorem with interpolation there are a small compact neighborhood M'_{j-1} of $M_{j-1} \cup \gamma$ and a holomorphic embedding $f'_{j-1} \colon M'_{j-1} \to \Omega$ satisfying the following properties:

- M'_{j-1} is homeomorphically isotopic to K_j in the sense of (1_j).
- $M'_{j-1} \cap E = E_{j-1}$.
- $|f'_{j-1}(p) - f_{j-1}(p)| < \epsilon'$.
- $f'_{j-1}(p) = f(p)$ for all $p \in E_{j-1}$. (Take into account (4_{j-1}).)
- $f'_{j-1}(M'_{j-1}) \cap f(E \setminus E_{j-1}) = \varnothing$. (Take into account (5_{j-1}).)
- $f'_{j-1}(M'_{j-1}) \subset \mathring{L}_j$. (Take into account (6_{j-1}).)
- $f'_{j-1}(M'_{j-1} \setminus \mathring{M}_{j-1}) \cap L_{j-1} = \varnothing$. (Take into account (7_{j-1}) and (4.7).)
- $f'_{j-1}(M_i \setminus \mathring{M}_{i-1}) \cap L_{i-1} = \varnothing$ for all $i = 0, \ldots, j-1$. (See (8_{j-1}).)

In view of (4.6), this reduces the proof of the inductive step to the case when $\chi(K_j \setminus \mathring{K}_{j-1}) = 0$, which we now explain.

Case 2: Assume that the Euler characteristic $\chi(K_j \setminus \mathring{K}_{j-1}) = 0$. In this case K_{j-1} is a strong deformation retract of K_j. We shall proceed in three steps, each one consisting of a different deformation procedure.

Step 1. Catching the points in $E_j \setminus E_{j-1}$. The aim of this step is to approximate f_{j-1} on M_{j-1} by a holomorphic embedding which is defined on a compact domain

containing $M_{j-1} \cup E_j$ in its relative interior and which matches with h everywhere on E_j. Our main tool in this step will be, again, the classical Mergelyan theorem with interpolation.

Assume that $E_j \setminus E_{j-1} \neq \varnothing$; otherwise we skip this step and proceed directly with Step 2 below. Since E_j is finite then so is $E_j \setminus E_{j-1}$. For each point $p \in E_j \setminus E_{j-1} \subset M \setminus M_{j-1}$ (see (2_{j-1})), choose a smooth embedded Jordan arc $\gamma_p \subset M \setminus \mathring{M}_{j-1}$ having an endpoint in $bM_{j-1} \setminus E$ and meeting bM_{j-1} transversely there, having p as the other endpoint, and being otherwise disjoint from $M_{j-1} \cup E$. Choose the arcs γ_p, $p \in E_j \setminus E_{j-1}$, to be pairwise disjoint. Obviously, for each $p \in E_j \setminus E_{j-1}$ the arc γ_p lies in the connected component of $M \setminus \mathring{M}_{j-1}$ containing the point p. Set

$$\Gamma := \bigcup_{p \in E_j \setminus E_{j-1}} \gamma_p \subset M \setminus \mathring{M}_{j-1}$$

and observe that

$$(M_{j-1} \cup \Gamma) \cap E = E_j \tag{4.8}$$

(take into account (2_{j-1})). Extend the holomorphic embedding f_{j-1}, with the same name, to a smooth embedding $f_{j-1}\colon M_{j-1} \cup \Gamma \to \Omega$ such that:

(i) $f_{j-1}(\Gamma) \subset \mathring{L}_j \setminus L_{j-1}$.
(ii) $f_{j-1}(p) = f(p)$ for all $p \in E_j \setminus E_{j-1}$.

Existence of such extension is clear from (5_{j-1}), (6_{j-1}), (7_{j-1}), and the fact that $\mathring{L}_j \setminus L_{j-1}$ is a connected domain which contains $f(E_j \setminus E_{j-1}) = \Lambda_j \setminus \Lambda_{j-1}$ (see (4.1) and (4.3)). In view of (6_{j-1}), (7_{j-1}), and (i) we have that

$$f_{j-1}(M_{j-1} \cup \Gamma) \subset \mathring{L}_j \quad \text{and} \quad f_{j-1}(\Gamma \cup bM_{j-1}) \cap L_{j-1} = \varnothing. \tag{4.9}$$

Since $M_{j-1} \cup \Gamma$ is an $\mathscr{O}(M)$-convex compact subset, given a small number $\delta > 0$ which will be specified later, Mergelyan's theorem with interpolation applied to $f_{j-1}\colon M_{j-1} \cup \Gamma \to \mathbb{C}^2$ furnishes a connected, smoothly bounded, $\mathscr{O}(M)$-convex compact domain $R \subset M$ and a holomorphic embedding $\phi\colon R \to \mathbb{C}^2$ meeting the following requirements:

(iii) $R \cap E = E_j \subset M_{j-1} \cup \Gamma \subset \mathring{R}$ and M_{j-1} is a strong deformation retract of R. (See (4.8).)
(iv) $|\phi(p) - f_{j-1}(p)| < \delta$ for all $p \in M_{j-1} \cup \Gamma$.
(v) $\phi(R \setminus \mathring{M}_{j-1}) \cap L_{j-1} = \varnothing$. (Take into account the second part of (4.9).)
(vi) $\phi(p) = f(p)$ for all $p \in E_j$. (See (4_{j-1}) and (ii).)

Moreover, in view of (iv) and the first part of (4.9) and assuming that $\delta > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small, we may and shall take R close enough to $M_{j-1} \cup \Gamma$ so that

$$\phi(R) \subset \mathring{L}_j. \tag{4.10}$$

On the other hand, since $\phi(R \setminus \mathring{M}_{j-1})$ is compact and L_{j-1} is compact and polynomially convex, in view of (v) there is a polynomially convex compact set $\mathscr{L} \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ such that

$$L_{j-1} \Subset \mathscr{L} \Subset L_j \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(R \setminus \mathring{M}_{j-1}) \cap \mathscr{L} = \varnothing. \tag{4.11}$$

Indeed, since L_{j-1} is a polynomially convex compact set we have that for any neighborhood U of L_{j-1} there is another neighborhood $V = V(U)$ of L_{j-1} such that if $Y \subset V$, Y compact, then the polynomial convex hull $\widehat{Y}$ of Y is contained in U. Thus, if the neighborhood U is chosen to lie in $\mathring{L}_j \setminus \phi(R \setminus \mathring{M}_{j-1})$, which is an open neighborhood of L_{j-1} by (4.1) and (v), and the compact set $Y \subset V(U)$ is chosen with $L_{j-1} \subset \mathring{Y}$, then the polynomially convex compact set $\mathscr{L} := \widehat{Y}$ meets the requirements in (4.11).

This concludes the first deformation stage in the proof of the inductive step.

Step 2: Pushing the boundary out of L_j. In this second step we will deform $\phi(R)$ near its boundary in order to obtain an embedded complex curve whose boundary does not intersect L_j. To do that we shall use the following approximation result by proper holomorphic embeddings into $\mathbb{C}^2$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $L \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be a polynomially convex compact set, let $R = \mathring{R} \cup bR$ be a compact bordered Riemann surface, let $K \subset \mathring{R}$ be a smoothly bounded compact domain, and assume that there is an embedding $\phi\colon R \to \mathbb{C}^2$ of class $\mathscr{A}^1(R)$ such that*

$$\phi(R \setminus \mathring{K}) \cap L = \varnothing. \tag{4.12}$$

Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is a proper holomorphic embedding $\widetilde{\phi}\colon \mathring{R} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ satisfying the following properties:

(I) $|\widetilde{\phi}(p) - \phi(p)| < \epsilon$ *for all* $p \in K$.
(II) $\widetilde{\phi}(\mathring{R} \setminus \mathring{K}) \cap L = \varnothing$.

Lemma 4.1 is an extension of Lemma 3.2 in Alarcón and López [3], where the polynomially convex compact set is assumed to be a round ball. The proof of the above lemma will consists of adapting the methods developed by Wold in [28] and by Forstnerič and Wold in [15], for embedding bordered Riemann surfaces in $\mathbb{C}^2$, in order to guarantee condition (II). We defer the proof of Lemma 4.1 to Subsec. 4.3.

Assume Lemma 4.1 and let us continue with the proof of the inductive step.

Let $R_0 \subset M$ be a smoothly bounded compact domain such that

$$M_{j-1} \cup \Gamma \Subset R_0 \Subset R. \tag{4.13}$$

Note that $\phi(R \setminus \mathring{R}_0) \cap \mathscr{L} = \varnothing$ by (4.11), and hence Lemma 4.1 may be applied to the polynomially convex compact set $\mathscr{L}$, the compact bordered Riemann surface R, the domain R_0, and the embedding ϕ. Therefore, given a small number $\widetilde{\delta} > 0$ which will be specified later, there exists a proper holomorphic embedding $\widetilde{\phi}\colon \mathring{R} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ such that:

(vii) $|\widetilde{\phi}(p) - \phi(p)| < \widetilde{\delta}$ for all $p \in R_0$.
(viii) $\widetilde{\phi}(\mathring{R} \setminus \mathring{R}_0) \cap \mathscr{L} = \varnothing$.

Assuming that $\widetilde{\delta} > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small, (4.10) and (vii) guarantee that

$$\widetilde{\phi}(M_{j-1}) \subset \widetilde{\phi}(R_0) \subset \mathring{L}_j. \tag{4.14}$$

On the other hand, since $R \subset M$ is a compact domain and M_{j-1} is a strong deformation retract of R (see (iii)), $R \setminus \mathring{M}_{j-1}$ consists of finitely many, pairwise disjoint, smoothly bounded, compact annuli in M. By (4.14), $\widetilde{\phi}$ maps the boundary components of these annuli which lie in bM_{j-1} into $\mathring{L}_j$; hence, since $\widetilde{\phi}\colon \mathring{R} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ is a proper map, given a number

$$0 < \tau < \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{dist}(L_j, \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \mathring{L}_{j+1}) \tag{4.15}$$

there is a connected, smoothly bounded, $\mathscr{O}(M)$-convex compact domain M_j with the following properties:

(ix) $R_0 \Subset M_j \Subset R$ and M_{j-1} is a strong deformation retract of M_j.

(x) $\mathrm{dist}(\widetilde{\phi}(M_j), \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \mathring{L}_{j+1}) > \tau$ and $\mathrm{dist}(\widetilde{\phi}(bM_j), L_j) > \tau$. In particular, we have $\widetilde{\phi}(M_j) \subset \mathring{L}_{j+1}$ and $\widetilde{\phi}(bM_j) \cap L_j = \varnothing$.

(xi) $\widetilde{\phi}(M_j) \cap (\Lambda_{j+1} \setminus \Lambda_j) = \varnothing$.

Indeed, since the set $\Lambda_{j+1} \setminus \Lambda_j = f(E_{j+1} \setminus E_j) \subset \mathring{L}_{j+1} \setminus L_j$ is finite (see (4.3)), condition (xi) may be achieved by a slight deformation of $\widetilde{\phi}$ (for instance, by composing with a small translation in $\mathbb{C}^2$); alternatively, we may simply choose the domain $M_j \subset M$ such that $\widetilde{\phi}(M_j)$ is contained in a small neighborhood of L_j in $\mathring{L}_{j+1}$ being disjoint from $\Lambda_{j+1} \setminus \Lambda_j$. (For the latter approach we have to choose $\tau > 0$ in (4.15) sufficiently small to make possible the second inequality in (x), to be precise, $\tau < \mathrm{dist}(L_j, \Lambda_{j+1} \setminus \Lambda_j)$.)

This concludes the second deformation stage.

Step 3: Matching up with f on E_j. We will now slightly perturb $\widetilde{\phi}$ to make it agree with f everywhere on E_j. To do that we shall use the following existence result for holomorphic automorphisms of $\mathbb{C}^2$.

Lemma 4.2. *Given a number $r > 0$ and a finite set $\Lambda \subset r\mathbb{B} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^2\colon |z| < r\}$ there exist numbers $\eta > 0$ and $\mu > 0$ such that the following holds. Given a number $0 < \beta < \eta$ and a map $\varphi\colon \Lambda \to \mathbb{C}^2$ such that*

$$|\varphi(z) - z| < \beta \quad \textit{for all } z \in \Lambda, \tag{4.16}$$

there is a holomorphic automorphism $\Psi\colon \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{C}^2$ satisfying the following conditions:

(I) $\Psi(\varphi(z)) = z$ *for all* $z \in \Lambda$.

(II) $|\Psi(z) - z| < \mu\beta$ *for all* $z \in r\overline{\mathbb{B}}$.

Lemma 4.2 for $r = 1$ is due to Globevnik (see [18, Lemma 7.2]); we shall prove the general case as an application of this particular one. (We point out that, alternatively, the proof given in [18, Lemma 7.2] may be easily adapted to work for arbitrary radious.) Note that the number $\eta > 0$ provided by the above lemma must be small enough so that every map $\varphi\colon \Lambda \to \mathbb{C}^2$ satisfying the inequality (4.16) for any $0 < \beta < \eta$ is injective; otherwise condition (I) would lead to a contradiction. We postpone the proof of Lemma 4.2 to Subsec. 4.3.

Assume Lemma 4.2 and let us continue with the proof of the inductive step.

Since $L_{j+1} \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ is compact, there is a number $r > 0$ such that

$$L_{j+1} \subset r\mathbb{B} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^2 \colon |z| < r\}. \tag{4.17}$$

Recall that the set $\Lambda_{j+1} = f(E_{j+1}) \subset \mathring{L}_{j+1}$ given in (4.3) is finite and let $\eta > 0$ and $\mu > 0$ be the numbers provided by Lemma 4.2 applied to r and Λ_{j+1} (take into account (4.17)). It is clear that

$$\text{neither } \eta \text{ nor } \mu \text{ depend on the choice of the constants } \delta \text{ and } \widetilde{\delta}. \tag{4.18}$$

Also recall that $E_j \subset M_j$ (see (iii)) and that $f|_{E_{j+1}} \colon E_{j+1} \to \Lambda_{j+1}$ is a bijection. Consider the map $\varphi \colon \Lambda_{j+1} \to \mathbb{C}^2$ given by

$$\Lambda_{j+1} \ni f(p) \longmapsto \varphi(f(p)) = \begin{cases} \widetilde{\phi}(p) & \text{if } p \in E_j, \\ f(p) & \text{if } p \in E_{j+1} \setminus E_j. \end{cases}$$

Property (xi) and the facts that $\widetilde{\phi} \colon M_j \to \mathbb{C}^2$ is injective and that $f|_{E_j} \colon E_j \to f(E_j) = \Lambda_j \subset \Lambda_{j+1}$ is a bijection guarantee that φ is well defined and injective. Notice that $\varphi|_{\Lambda_{j+1} \setminus \Lambda_j}$ is the inclusion map. Moreover, conditions (vi) and (vii) ensure that

$$|\varphi(z) - z| < \widetilde{\delta} \quad \text{for all } z \in \Lambda_{j+1};$$

note that $E_j \subset M_j$ by (iii), (4.13), and (ix). Thus, assuming as we may that $\widetilde{\delta} > 0$ has been chosen to be smaller than η (see (4.18)), Lemma 4.2 furnishes a holomorphic automorphism $\Psi \colon \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{C}^2$ enjoying the following conditions:

(xii) $\Psi(\varphi(z)) = z$ for all $z \in \Lambda_{j+1}$.

(xiii) $|\Psi(z) - z| < \mu\widetilde{\delta}$ for all $z \in r\overline{\mathbb{B}}$.

This finishes the third (and final) deformation procedure in the proof of the inductive step.

We now prove the following.

Claim 4.3. *If the numbers $\delta > 0$ and $\widetilde{\delta} > 0$ are chosen sufficiently small, then the connected, smoothly bounded, $\mathscr{O}(M)$-convex compact domain M_j and the holomorphic embedding*

$$f_j := \Psi \circ \widetilde{\phi} \colon M_j \to \mathbb{C}^2$$

meet requirements (1_j)–(8_j) above.

Indeed, conditions (1_j) and (2_j) are granted by (1_{j-1}), (iii), (4.13), (ix), and the initial assumption that the Euler characteristic $\chi(K_j \setminus \mathring{K}_{j-1}) = 0$. Notice now that (iv), (vii), (x), and (4.17) give

$$\begin{cases} |f_j(p) - \widetilde{\phi}(p)| < \mu\widetilde{\delta} & \text{for all } p \in M_j, \\ |f_j(p) - \phi(p)| < (1+\mu)\widetilde{\delta} & \text{for all } p \in R_0, \\ |f_j(p) - f_{j-1}(p)| < \delta + (1+\mu)\widetilde{\delta} & \text{for all } p \in M_{j-1} \cup \Gamma. \end{cases} \tag{4.19}$$

Thus, property (3_j) is implied by (4.19) provided that $\delta > 0$ and $\widetilde{\delta} > 0$ are chosen so that $\delta + (1+\mu)\widetilde{\delta} < \epsilon_{j-1}$ holds; recall that the number $\mu > 0$ does not depend

on the choice of $\widetilde{\delta}$ (see (4.18)). To check (4_j) pick a point $p \in E_j$. We have that $f(p) \in \Lambda_j \subset \Lambda_{j+1}$, and so

$$f_j(p) = \Psi(\widetilde{\phi}(p)) \overset{p \in E_j}{=} \Psi(\varphi(f(p))) \overset{\text{(xii)}}{=} f(p).$$

Properties (6_j) and (7_j) follow from (x) and (4.19) provided that we choose $\widetilde{\delta} < \tau/\mu$, where $\tau > 0$ is the number given in (4.15); take into account that neither τ nor μ depend on the choice of $\widetilde{\delta}$. Now, (6_j) and (4.3) ensure that

$$f_j(M_j) \cap f(E \setminus E_{j+1}) = \varnothing. \tag{4.20}$$

On the other hand, given a point $p \in E_{j+1} \setminus E_j$ we have that $\varphi(f(p)) = f(p)$ and so

$$\Psi(f(p)) = \Psi(\varphi(f(p))) \overset{\text{(xii)}}{=} f(p).$$

Thus, since $\Psi\colon \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{C}^2$ is a bijection and $f(p) \notin \widetilde{\phi}(M_j)$ by (xi), we infer that

$$f(p) = \Psi(f(p)) \notin \Psi(\widetilde{\phi}(M_j)) = f_j(M_j);$$

together with (4.20) we obtain (5_j). Finally, (8_{j-1}) and (4.19) ensure that

$$f_j(M_i \setminus \mathring{M}_{i-1}) \cap L_{i-1} = \varnothing \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, j-1, \tag{4.21}$$

provided that the numbers $\delta > 0$ and $\widetilde{\delta} > 0$ are chosen to satisfy

$$\delta + (1+\mu)\widetilde{\delta} < \min\big\{\operatorname{dist}\big(f_{j-1}(M_i \setminus \mathring{M}_{i-1}), L_{i-1}\big) \colon i = 1, \dots, j-1\big\}.$$

Note that the number in the right-hand side of the above inequality does not depend on the choices of δ and $\widetilde{\delta}$ and, in view of (8_{j-1}), is positive. On the other hand, (4.11) and (4.19) give that

$$f_j(R_0 \setminus \mathring{M}_{j-1}) \cap L_{j-1} = \varnothing, \tag{4.22}$$

provided that $(1+\mu)\widetilde{\delta} < \operatorname{dist}(L_{j-1}, \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \mathring{\mathscr{L}})$; observe that the number in the right-hand side of this inequality is positive and does not depend on the choice of $\widetilde{\delta}$ (see (4.11)). Likewise, (viii) and (4.19) ensure that

$$f_j(M_j \setminus \mathring{R}_0) \cap L_{j-1} = \varnothing, \tag{4.23}$$

whenever that we choose $\widetilde{\delta} < \frac{1}{\mu}\operatorname{dist}(L_{j-1}, \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \mathring{\mathscr{L}})$. Taking into account (ix), we infer from (4.22) and (4.23) that

$$f_j(M_j \setminus \mathring{M}_{j-1}) \cap L_{j-1} = \varnothing.$$

This and (4.21) show condition (8_j). This concludes the proof of Claim 4.3.

Once we have granted conditions (1_j)–(8_j), to complete the proof of the inductive step it only remains to choose a number $\epsilon_j > 0$ satisfying (9_j) and (10_j). Taking into account (8_j) and the facts that $M_{j-1} \subset \mathring{M}_j$ and that $f_j\colon M_j \to \Omega$ is a holomorphic embedding (cf. properties (A) and (B) above), such number exists by the Cauchy estimates, the compactness of M_j, and the openness of Ω.

This completes the proof of the inductive step in case $\chi(K_j \setminus \mathring{K}_{j-1}) = 0$, thereby proving the inductive step and closing the induction in the proof of Theorem 3.1, under the assumption that Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2 hold.

4.3. Completion of the proof. To complete the proof of Theorem 3.1 it remains to prove Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2. We shall do it in this subsection.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Let L, R, K, ϕ, and ϵ be as in the statement of Lemma 4.1. Assume without loss of generality that R is a smoothly bounded compact domain in an open Riemann surface, $\widetilde{R}$, and, by Mergelyan's theorem and a shrinking of $\widetilde{R}$ around R if necessary, that ϕ is a holomorphic embedding $\phi\colon \widetilde{R} \to \mathbb{C}^2$. Also, up to enlarging K if necessary, we may and shall assume that K is a strong deformation retract of R.

Let $\pi_i\colon \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{C}$ be the projection $\pi_i(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) = \zeta_i$, $i = 1, 2$. For each $z \in \mathbb{C}^2$, denote

$$\Lambda_z := \pi_1^{-1}(\pi_1(z)) = \{(\pi_1(z), \zeta)\colon \zeta \in \mathbb{C}\}.$$

Denote by $C_1, \ldots, C_m$ the connected components of bR. Since $L \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ is a polynomially convex compact set, $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus L$ is a connected domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and hence path-connected. Thus, (4.12) enables us to choose pairwise disjoint smoothly embedded Jordan arcs $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m$ in $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus L$ meeting the following requirements for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$:

(a1) λ_j has an endpoint w_j in $\phi(C_j)$ and is otherwise disjoint from $\phi(R)$.

(a2) The other endpoint z_j of λ_j is an *exposed point* (with respect to the projection π_1) for the set $\phi(R) \cup (\bigcup_{k=1}^m \lambda_k)$ in the sense of [15, Def. 4.1].

(a3) $\Lambda_{z_j} \cap L = \varnothing$. (Recall that L is compact.)

Set $a_j := \phi^{-1}(w_j)$ and note that a_j is a well-defined point in C_j, $j = 1, \ldots, m$. Let $V \subset R \setminus K$ be a neighborhood of $\{a_1, \ldots, a_m\}$ in R and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ be a number which will be specified later. Reasoning as in [15, Proof of Theorem 4.2] or [3, Proof of Lemma 3.2], we obtain, up to slightly deforming λ_j near w_j if necessary, a holomorphic embedding $\psi\colon R \to \mathbb{C}^2$ enjoying the following properties:

(b1) $|\psi(p) - \phi(p)| < \epsilon_0$ for all $p \in R \setminus V$.

(b2) $\operatorname{dist}(\psi(p), \lambda_j) < \epsilon_0$ for all $p \in V_j$, where V_j is the component of V containing a_j, $j = 1, \ldots, m$.

(b3) $\psi(a_j) = z_j$ is an exposed boundary point of $\psi(R)$, $j = 1, \ldots, m$.

Moreover, choosing $\epsilon_0 > 0$ small enough, properties (b1), (b2), and (4.12) ensure that

(b4) $\psi(R \setminus \mathring{K}) \cap L = \varnothing$.

Now, given $\epsilon_1 > 0$ which will be specified later, arguing as in [15, Proof of Theorem 5.1] or [3, Proof of Lemma 3.2], there are numbers $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ such that the rational shear map g of $\mathbb{C}^2$ defined by

$$g(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) = \Big(\zeta_1\,,\, \zeta_2 + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\alpha_j}{\zeta_1 - \pi_1(z_j)}\Big)$$

satisifes the following conditions:

(c1) The projection π_2 maps the curve $\mu_j := g(\psi(C_j \setminus \{a_j\})) \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ into an unbounded curve $\delta_j \subset \mathbb{C}$ and $\pi_2|_{\mu_j} : \mu_j \to \delta_j$ is a diffeomorphism near infinity, $j = 1, \ldots, m$.

(c2) The complement of the set $r\overline{\mathbb{D}} \cup (\bigcup_{j=1}^m \delta_j) \subset \mathbb{C}$ in $\mathbb{C}$ has no relatively compact connected components for any large enough $r > 0$.

(c3) $|g(z) - z| < \epsilon_1$ for all $z \in \psi(R \setminus V)$.

(c4) $g(\psi(W \setminus \mathring{K})) \cap L = \varnothing$ where $W := R \setminus \{a_1, \ldots, a_m\}$.

To ensure condition (c4) we use (a3) and (b4). Furthermore, setting

$$\widetilde{\psi} := g \circ \psi|_W,$$

it also holds that

(c5) there is a polynomially convex compact set $L_0 \subset \widetilde{\psi}(W)$ in $\mathbb{C}^2$ such that $L \cup L_0$ is polynomially convex and $\widetilde{\psi}(K) \subset L_0$.

Now, by the results in [28] (see also [15, Proof of Theorem 5.1]), given $\epsilon_2 > 0$ to be specified later, there are a Fatou-Bieberbach domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ and a biholomorphic map $\varphi \colon D \to \mathbb{C}^2$ (i.e., a Fatou-Bieberbach map) such that $\widetilde{\psi}(W) \cup L \subset D$, the boundaries $b(\widetilde{\psi}(W)) \subset bD$, and

$$|\varphi(z) - z| < \epsilon_2 \quad \text{for all } z \in L \cup (D \cap L_0). \tag{4.24}$$

We claim that the map

$$\widetilde{\phi} := \varphi \circ \widetilde{\psi}|_{\mathring{R}} \colon \mathring{R} \to \mathbb{C}^2$$

is a proper holomorphic embedding $\mathring{R} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ which satisfies the conclusion of the lemma. Indeed, provided that the positive numbers ϵ_0, ϵ_1, and ϵ_2 are chosen sufficiently small, condition (I) is ensured by (b1), (c3), (c4), and (4.24), while condition (II) is implied by (c4), (c5), and (4.24).

This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.1. □

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Let r and Λ be as in the statement of Lemma 4.2. Without loss of generality we assume that $r \geq 1$; notice that if the lemma holds for some $r > 0$ then it also holds for all numbers $r' \in (0, r)$.

Since $\frac{1}{r}\Lambda$ is a finite set in $\mathbb{B}$, [18, Lemma 7.2] provides numbers $\eta > 0$ and $\mu > 0$ with the property that given $0 < \delta < \eta$ and a map $\phi \colon \Lambda \to \mathbb{C}^2$ such that

$$|\phi(z) - z| < \delta \quad \text{for all } z \in \frac{1}{r}\Lambda,$$

there exists a holomorphic automorphism $\Phi \colon \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{C}^2$ meeting

(a) $\Phi(\phi(z)) = z$ for all $z \in \frac{1}{r}\Lambda$, and

(b) $|\Phi(z) - z| < \mu\delta$ for all $z \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}$.

We claim that η and μ satisfy the conclusion of Lemma 4.2. Indeed, let $0 < \beta < \eta$ and $\varphi \colon \Lambda \to \mathbb{C}^2$ be as in the statement of the lemma; in particular, satisfying the inequality (4.16). Consider the map $\phi \colon \frac{1}{r}\Lambda \to \mathbb{C}^2$ given by

$$\phi(z) = \frac{1}{r}\varphi(rz), \quad z \in \frac{1}{r}\Lambda.$$

Since $r \geq 1$ and $0 < \beta < \eta$ then for any $z \in \frac{1}{r}\Lambda$ we have that

$$|\phi(z) - z| = \left|\frac{1}{r}\varphi(rz) - z\right| = \frac{1}{r}|\varphi(rz) - rz| \overset{(4.16)}{<} \frac{\beta}{r} < \eta,$$

and hence there is a holomorphic automorphism $\Phi\colon \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{C}^2$ enjoying conditions (a) and (b) above with δ replaced by β/r. Consider the holomorphic automorphism $\Psi\colon \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{C}^2$ given by

$$\Psi(z) = r\Phi\Big(\frac{z}{r}\Big), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^2.$$

Given $z \in \Lambda$ we have

$$\Psi(\varphi(z)) = r\Phi\Big(\frac{\varphi(z)}{r}\Big) = r\Phi\Big(\phi\Big(\frac{z}{r}\Big)\Big) \overset{\text{(a)}}{=} r\frac{z}{r} = z,$$

which proves condition (I) in the statement of Lemma 4.2. On the other hand, for $z \in r\overline{\mathbb{B}}$ we infer that

$$|\Psi(z) - z| = \Big|r\Phi\Big(\frac{z}{r}\Big) - z\Big| = r\Big|\Phi\Big(\frac{z}{r}\Big) - \frac{z}{r}\Big| \overset{\text{(b)}}{<} r\mu\frac{\beta}{r} = \mu\beta.$$

This shows condition (II), thereby concluding the proof of Lemma 4.2. □

This closes the induction in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is complete.

Theorem 1.1 is proved.

Acknowledgements. A. Alarcón is supported by the Ramón y Cajal program of the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness and partially supported by the MINECO/FEDER grant no. MTM2014-52368-P, Spain.

Part of the work on this paper was done while the author was visiting the Center for Advanced Study in Oslo (in December 2016) and the School of Mathematical Sciences at the University of Adelaide (in March 2017). He would like to thank these institutions for the hospitality and for providing excellent working conditions.

The author wishes to thank Franc Forstnerič for helpful discussions.

References

[1] A. Alarcón and J. Globevnik. Complete embedded complex curves in the ball of $\mathbb{C}^2$ can have any topology. Preprint arXiv:1611.06913.

[2] A. Alarcón, J. Globevnik, and F. J. López. A construction of complete complex hypersurfaces in the ball with control on the topology. J. Reigne Angew Math., in press.

[3] A. Alarcón and F. J. López. Proper holomorphic embeddings of Riemann surfaces with arbitrary topology into $\mathbb{C}^2$. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 23(4):1794–1805, 2013.

[4] R. Andrist, F. Forstnerič, T. Ritter, and E. F. Wold. Proper holomorphic embeddings into Stein manifolds with the density property. *J. Anal. Math.*, 130:135–150, 2016.

[5] R. Andrist and E. F. Wold. Riemann surfaces in Stein manifolds with the density property. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 64(2):681–697, 2014.

[6] E. Bishop. Subalgebras of functions on a Riemann surface. *Pacific J. Math.*, 8:29–50, 1958.

[7] B. Drinovec Drnovšek and F. Forstnerič. Holomorphic curves in complex spaces. *Duke Math. J.*, 139(2):203–253, 2007.

[8] B. Drinovec Drnovšek and F. Forstnerič. Strongly pseudoconvex domains as subvarieties of complex manifolds. *Amer. J. Math.*, 132(2):331–360, 2010.

[9] H. M. Farkas and I. Kra. *Riemann surfaces*, volume 71 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1992.
[10] F. Forstnerič. *Stein manifolds and holomorphic mappings*, volume 56 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011. The homotopy principle in complex analysis.
[11] F. Forstnerič and J. Globevnik. Discs in pseudoconvex domains. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 67(1):129–145, 1992.
[12] F. Forstnerič, J. Globevnik, and J.-P. Rosay. Nonstraightenable complex lines in $\mathbf{C}^2$. *Ark. Mat.*, 34(1):97–101, 1996.
[13] F. Forstnerič, J. Globevnik, and B. Stensønes. Embedding holomorphic discs through discrete sets. *Math. Ann.*, 305(3):559–569, 1996.
[14] F. Forstnerič and M. Slapar. Deformations of Stein structures and extensions of holomorphic mappings. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 14(2):343–357, 2007.
[15] F. Forstnerič and E. F. Wold. Bordered Riemann surfaces in $\mathbb{C}^2$. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 91(1):100–114, 2009.
[16] J. Globevnik. Discs in the ball containing given discrete sets. *Math. Ann.*, 281(1):87–96, 1988.
[17] J. Globevnik. Relative embeddings of discs into convex domains. *Invent. Math.*, 98(2):331–350, 1989.
[18] J. Globevnik. Embedding complete holomorphic discs through discrete sets. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 444(2):827–838, 2016.
[19] L. Hörmander. *An introduction to complex analysis in several variables*, volume 7 of *North-Holland Mathematical Library*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, third edition, 1990.
[20] F. Lárusson and T. Ritter. Proper holomorphic immersions in homotopy classes of maps from finitely connected planar domains into $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^*$. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 63(2):367–383, 2014.
[21] S. N. Mergelyan. On the representation of functions by series of polynomials on closed sets. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.)*, 78:405–408, 1951.
[22] R. M. Range. *Holomorphic functions and integral representations in several complex variables*, volume 108 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986.
[23] R. M. Range. What is... a pseudoconvex domain? *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 59(2):301–303, 2012.
[24] T. Ritter. A soft Oka principle for proper holomorphic embeddings of open Riemann surfaces into $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$. J. Reine Angew. Math., in press.
[25] J.-P. Rosay and W. Rudin. Holomorphic embeddings of $\mathbf{C}$ in $\mathbf{C}^n$. In *Several complex variables (Stockholm, 1987/1988)*, volume 38 of *Math. Notes*, pages 563–569. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.
[26] C. Runge. Zur Theorie der Analytischen Functionen. *Acta Math.*, 6(1):245–248, 1885.
[27] E. L. Stout. *Polynomial convexity*, volume 261 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2007.
[28] E. F. Wold. Proper holomorphic embeddings of finitely and some infinitely connected subsets of $\mathbb{C}$ into $\mathbb{C}^2$. *Math. Z.*, 252(1):1–9, 2006.

Antonio Alarcón

Departamento de Geometría y Topología e Instituto de Matemáticas (IEMath-GR), Universidad de Granada, Campus de Fuentenueva s/n, E–18071 Granada, Spain.

e-mail: alarcon@ugr.es